

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present Application. Claims 14-50 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-13 are cancelled. Claims 14, 32, and 40 are independent claims. By this response, claims 14, 32, and 40 are amended.

35 U.S.C. §112 First Paragraph Rejections

Claims 14-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed

Claim 14

Claim 14 stands rejected as not having a basis in the specification for the limitation "such that repayment costs are distributed amongst elevator users according to a predetermined fee schedule." In view of the Examiner's stated rationale for maintaining this rejection, Applicant hereby amends claim 14 to instead recite the limitation: "such that repayment costs are distributed amongst elevator users on a passenger-specific basis." Support for this limitation may be found on page 2 of the specification, on lines 32 – 35.

Claim 32

Claim 32 stands rejected as not having a basis for the claim limitation "wherein an appropriate fee is assessed to each passenger upon the interaction of said reader device and said access device based on a predetermined fee schedule such that repayment costs are equitably distributed." In view of the Examiner's stated rationale for maintaining this rejection, Applicant hereby amends claim 32 to instead recite the limitation : "wherein an appropriate fee is assessed to each passenger upon the

interaction of said reader device and said access device on a passenger-specific basis such that repayment costs are equitably distributed." Support for this limitation may be found on page 2 of the specification, on lines 32 – 35.

Claim 40

Claim 40 stands rejected as not having a basis for the claim limitation "wherein an appropriate fee is assessed to each passenger upon the interaction of said reader device and said access device based on a predetermined fee schedule such that repayment costs are equitably distributed." In view of the Examiner's stated rationale for maintaining this rejection, Applicant hereby amends claim 40 to instead recite the limitation : "wherein an appropriate fee is assessed to each passenger upon the interaction of said reader device and said access device on a passenger-specific basis such that repayment costs are equitably distributed." Support for this limitation may be found on page 2 of the specification, on lines 32 – 35.

Claims 15 – 31, 33 – 39, and 49 – 50

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15 – 31, 33 – 39, and 49 – 50 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 14, 32, and 40.

Summary

At least for the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 14, 32, and 40, and all claims depending therefrom, now meet the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that claims are allowable.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Naphtali Y. Matlis, Reg. No. 61,592, at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant